UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,991	06/25/2003	Apurva F. Dalia	MSFT120702	5131

26389 7590 02/27/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
ANYA, CHARLES E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,991	DALIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Anya	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/27/06*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 20-39 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

i. "the at least one application" on line 5 of claim 34.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change "the at least one application" to "the at least one application program".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 20,22,23,25-28,31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069874 A1 to Hertzog et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/02127553 A1 to Lai.

5. As to claim 20, Hertzog teaches an integrated address book clearinghouse interface stored on computer-readable storage medium, the integrated address book clearinghouse interface comprising: a plurality of function modules, usable by a plurality of application programs for managing a plurality of address books that form an integrated address book clearinghouse, by performing functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse (figure 3 page 5 paragraphs 0061-0069); an encapsulation module for encapsulating in data envelopes requests for the performance of functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse and authorization to perform the requested functions ("...encodes...encapsulated..." page 5 paragraph 0061, Authentication Function 60 page 5 paragraph 0064); an address book function call module for generating function calls requesting the performance of functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse if such requested functions are authorized ("...calls..." page 5 paragraph 0063);

Hertzog is silent with reference to an analyzing module for analyzing data envelopes to detect requests to perform functions on the address book clearinghouse to perform such requested functions; a function call processing module for processing function calls requesting the performance of functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse; a function call response module for generating responses to processed

function calls; and a response encapsulation module for encapsulating in data envelopes responses to processed function calls and information identifying an address book of the plurality of address books on which a function call was carried out.

Lai teaches an analyzing module for analyzing data envelopes to detect requests to perform functions on the address book clearinghouse to perform such requested functions (HTTP Daemon 21 page 2 paragraph 0029, Step 63 page 3 paragraph 0036); a function call processing module for processing function calls requesting the performance of functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...network service..." page 3 paragraph 0036, Network Services 77 page 3 paragraph 0037); a function call response module for generating responses to processed function calls ("...network service..." page 3 paragraph 0036, Network Services 77 page 3 paragraph 0037); and a response encapsulation module for encapsulating in data envelopes responses to processed function calls and information identifying an address book of the plurality of address books on which a function call was carried out (HTTP Daemon 21 page 3 paragraph 0036).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hertzog with the teaching of Lai because the teaching of Lai would improve the system of Hertzog by providing HTTP proxy and daemon for handling underlying transmission protocol so that the cost and difficult of program development is significantly reduced (Lai page 1 paragraph 0017).

6. As to claim 22, Hertzog teaches an integrated address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in Claim 20, wherein the functions to be performed on the integrated address book clearinghouse include the addition of an address book to the integrated address book clearinghouse (Add New User Function 64 page 5 paragraph 0066).

7. As to claim 23, Hertzog teaches an integrated Claim 20, wherein the functions to be address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in performed on the integrated address book clearinghouse include the modification of an address included in one or more of the plurality of address books that form the integrated address book clearinghouse (Put Contact Updates Function 68 page 5 paragraph 0068).

8. As to claim 25, Hertzog teaches an integrated address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in Claim 20, wherein the plurality of address books that form the integrated address book clearinghouse are each associated with a particular user identity ("...specific user..." page 4 paragraph 0050).

9. As to claim 26, Hertzog teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse comprising: generating a request to perform a function on the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...encodes information..." page 5 paragraph 0061, Browser 20/Client Services Module 26 page 17 paragraph 0176), the function comprising one of a plurality of functions usable by a plurality of

application programs for managing the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...authentication function..." page 5 paragraphs 0062-0069), the integrated address book clearinghouse comprising a plurality of address books (Server Database 34 page 4 paragraph 0050); determining if the request to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse also includes authorization to perform the request ("...in case of valid user..." page 5 paragraph 0062, "...if the user is authenticated..." page 5 paragraph 0064); performing the requested function on the integrated address book clearinghouse if the request includes the authorization to perform the request (Get New Contact Identity Function 62/Add New User Function 64/Get New Contacts Updates Function 66/Put Contact Updates Function 68/Close Session Function 70 page 5 paragraph 0065), **while Lai teaches** generating a response to the request after the request is performed, the response including information that identifies the address book of the plurality of address books on which the requested function was performed ("...HTTP response..." page 3 paragraph 0036, "...responding the HTTP message..." page 3 paragraph 0037); and sending the response to the source of the request ("...transmits this HTTP response..." page 3 paragraph 0036).

10. As to claim 27, Hertzog teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26, wherein the request to perform a function on an integrated address book clearinghouse is: generated by a client (Client Services Module 26 page 5 paragraph 0061, Browser 20/Client Services Module 26 page 17 paragraph 0176); encapsulated in a data

envelope ("...encodes information...XML stream..." page 5 paragraph 0061); and the data envelope sent to a server ("...sent to the application server 40..." page 5 paragraph 0061), which determines if the request to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse also includes authorization to perform the request ("...in case of valid user..." page 5 paragraph 0062, "...if the user is authenticated..." page 5 paragraph 0064).

11. As to claim 28, Hertzog teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26 wherein: (a) generating the request to perform a function on an integrated address book clearinghouse is performed by a client (Client Services Module 26 page 5 paragraph 0061, Browser 20/Client Services Module 26 page 17 paragraph 0176); and (b) a server: (i) determines if the request to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse also includes authorization to perform the request ("...in case of valid user..." page 5 paragraph 0062, "...if the user is authenticated..." page 5 paragraph 0064); (ii) if the request includes authorization to perform the request, performs the requested function on the integrated address book clearinghouse (Get New Contact Identity Function 62/Add New User Function 64/Get New Contacts Updates Function 66/Put Contact Updates Function 68/Close Session Function 70 page 5 paragraph 0065), **while Lai teaches** (iii) after the request is performed, generates a response to the request, the response including information that identifies the address book of the plurality of address books on which the request was performed ("...HTTP

response..." page 3 paragraph 0036, "...responding the HTTP message..." page 3 paragraph 0037); and (iv) sends the response to the source of the request, i.e., the client ("...transmits this HTTP response..." page 3 paragraph 0036).

12. As to claim 31, Hertzog teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26, wherein the plurality of functions include adding an address book to the integrated address book clearinghouse (Add New User Function 64 page 5 paragraph 0066).

13. As to claim 32, Hertzog teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26, wherein the plurality of functions include modifying one or more of the plurality of address books forming the integrated address book clearinghouse (Put Contact Updates Function 68 page 5 paragraph 0068).

14. Claims 21,29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069874 A1 to Hertzog et al. U.S. Pub. No. 2003/02127553 A1 to Lai as applied to claims 20 or 26 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194295 A1 to Mercure et al.

As to claim 21, Lai and Hertzog is silent with reference to an integrated address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in Claim 20, including an authorization module

for seeking authority to authorize the requests for the performance of the functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse if a data envelope does not include authorization to perform the requests (Steps 68/70 page 2 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lai and Hertzog with the teaching of Mercure because the teaching of Mercure would improve the system of Lai and Hertzog by allowing for the re-authentication of a user when it is determined the login is unknown (Mercure page 2 paragraph 0032).

15. As to claim 29, Mercure teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26, wherein if the request does not include authorization to perform the request, seeking authorization to perform the request (Steps 68/70 page 2 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hertzog and Trent with the teaching of Mercure because the teaching of Mercure would improve the system of Hertzog and Trent by allowing for the re-authentication of a user when it is determined the login is unknown (Mercure page 2 paragraph 0032).

16. As to claim 30, Mercure teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 29, wherein seeking authorization to perform the request comprises: redirecting the request to perform a

function on the integrated address book clearinghouse to an authorization source; requesting the authorization source authorization to perform the requested function on the integrated address book clearinghouse; and if the authorization request is granted by the authorization source (Steps 68/70 page 2 paragraph 0032), while Hertzog teaches adding the authorization to the request to perform a function on the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...records..." page 4 paragraph 0050).

17. Claims 24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069874 A1 to Hertzog et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/02127553 A1 to Lai as applied to claims 20 or 26 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,961,620 to Trent et al.

18. As to claim 24, Hertzog is silent with reference to an integrated address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in Claim 20, wherein the functions to be performed on the integrated address book clearinghouse include the identification of all entries in the integrated address book clearinghouse that meet predetermined criteria ("...search address book information..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...view records by different criteria..." Col. 8 Ln. 53 – 58).

Trent teaches an integrated address book clearinghouse interface as claimed in Claim 20, wherein the functions to be performed on the integrated address book clearinghouse include the identification of all entries in the integrated address book

clearinghouse that meet predetermined criteria ("...search address book information..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...view records by different criteria..." Col. 8 Ln. 53 – 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hertzog with the teaching of Trent because the teaching of Trent would improve the system of Hertzog by allowing for the displaying/viewing of address book records in accordance to a preferred criteria (Trent Col. 8 Ln. 53 – 58).

19. As to claim 33, Trent teaches a computer-implemented method for managing an integrated address book clearinghouse as claimed in Claim 26, wherein the plurality of functions include an identification of all entries in the integrated address book clearinghouse meeting predetermined criteria ("...search address book information..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...view records by different criteria..." Col. 8 Ln. 53 – 58).

20. Claims 34 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,961,620 to Trent et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069874 A1 to Hertzog et al.

21. As to claim 34, Trent teaches a computer system comprising: (a) a plurality of clients, each of the clients including at least one application program (figures 2/3) capable of: (i) accessing a plurality of functions associated with the at least one application, the plurality of functions managing a plurality of user controlled address

books, the plurality of user controlled address books forming an integrated address book clearinghouse (Address Book Application Program Interfaces 220/222, Address Book Dynamic Link Library 210 Col. 5 Ln. 14 – 55, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 30, General Type manger 310 Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 9, Col. 8 Ln. 49 – 67); and (ii) generating a request to perform a function on the integrated address book clearinghouse to perform the request (Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...service requests..." Col. 7 Ln. 37 – 63); and a server arrangement for: (i) storing the integrated address book clearinghouse (Address Book Database Mass Storage Subsystem 116 Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 67); and (ii) receiving requests from the plurality of clients to perform functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...accessing...accesses...enter, edit, and search address book information..." Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 67, "...update individual records..." Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 13).

Trent is silent with reference to a server arrangement for: (iii) examining received requests to perform functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse to determine if the requests also include authorization to perform the requests; (iv) performing a function if a received request includes authorization to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse; and (v) reporting the performance of the function to the client that generated the request to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse, the reporting including information identifying a user controlled address book of the plurality of user controlled address books on which the function was performed.

Hertzog teaches a server arrangement for: (iii) examining received requests to perform functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse to determine if the

requests also include authorization to perform the requests ("...in the case of a valid user...or an exception..." page 5 paragraph 0063); (iv) performing a function if a received request includes authorization to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...return a response..."cookie"..." page 5 paragraph 0063); and (v) reporting the performance of the function to the client that generated the request to perform the function on the integrated address book clearinghouse, the reporting including information identifying a user controlled address book of the plurality of user controlled address books on which the function was performed ("...return a response..."cookie"..." page 5 paragraph 0063, Authentication Function 60 "...identify..." page 5 paragraph 0064).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Trent with the teaching of Hertzog because the teaching of Hertzog would improve the system of Trent by allowing for a single copy of personal information concerning a specific user to exist in a server database and is accessible to multiple users to who an owner has granted access permission (Hertzog page 4 paragraph 0050).

22. As to claim 36, Hertzog teaches a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein the server arrangement includes: a storage server for storing the integrated address book clearinghouse (Server Database 34 page 4 paragraph 0050); and a separate control server for receiving requests to perform functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse from the plurality of clients, examining received requests to

perform functions on the integrated address book clearinghouse to determine if the requests also include authorization to perform the requested functions, performing the requested functions (Application Server 40 page 5 paragraphs 0060-0064), and reporting the performance of a requested function to the client that generated the request, the reporting including information identifying a user controlled address book of the plurality of user controlled address books on which the function was performed ("...cookie..." page 5 paragraphs 0062/0064).

23. As to claim 37, Trent teaches a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein the plurality of functions include the addition of a user controlled address book to the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...edit..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...update..." Col. 6 Ln. 4 – 13, "...add/create..." Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 58).

24. As to claim 38, Trent teaches a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein the plurality of functions include modifying the content of one or more of the user controlled address books that form the integrated address book clearinghouse ("...edit..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...update..." Col. 6 Ln. 4 – 13, "...add/create..." Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 58 "...gtmEditAddress..." Col. 7 Ln. 42 – 53).

25. As to claim 39, Trent teaches a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein the plurality of functions include the identification of all entries in the integrated address book clearinghouse that meet predetermined criteria ("...search address book

information..." Col. 5 Ln. 62 – 65, "...view records by different criteria..." Col. 8 Ln. 53 – 58).

26. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,961,620 to Trent et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069874 A1 to Hertzog et al. as applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194295 A1 to Mercure et al.

27. As to claim 35, Hertzog and Trent are silent with reference to a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein if the received request does not include authorization to perform the requested function, the server arrangement seeks authorization to perform the requested function from an authorization source.

Mercure teaches a computer system as claimed in Claim 34, wherein if the received request does not include authorization to perform the requested function, the server arrangement seeks authorization to perform the requested function from an authorization source (Steps 68/70 page 2 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hertzog and Trent with the teaching of Mercure because the teaching of Mercure would improve the system of Hertzog and Trent by allowing for the re-authentication of a user when it is determined the login is unknown (Mercure page 2 paragraph 0032).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is 571-272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cea.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER